

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 4-32 and 36 are active in the case.

It is noted that the IDS filed March 31, 2003 has not been acknowledged by the Examiner. It is requested that the Examiner review the PTO 1449 and references supplied therewith, initial the appropriate boxes, sign and date the PTO 1449 and return a copy to Applicants with the next official action.

The specification has been amended on page 5, line 14 to delete "alkylene" and add "alkyl or alkenyl". Basis for the amendment may be found on page 5, lines 5-16 of the specification. Page 7 has been amended to delete the phrase "all incorporated herein by reference". The incorporation by reference of German Application 100100384.6 on page 9 of the specification has been retained, since it refers to the priority document and is appropriate for incorporation by reference under these circumstances. It is submitted that the objections to the specification have been obviated.

The Examiner's indication of allowability for Claims 20-32 and indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 1 and 4-19 are appreciated.

New Claim 36 has been added incorporating much of the language proposed by the Examiner with the exception that the reference to Compound A as a "monomer or oligomer" has been deleted, since page 3, lines 17 and 18 clearly indicate that Compounds A and B are not limited to monomers or oligomers. Further, step b) has been limited to the phrase "reacting an organofunctional group of the silicon Compound A with the surface of an organofunctional substrate to form a polar treated surface". Step c) has been expanded to recite "exposing the polar treated surface to UV radiation to initiate crosslinking between the at least one of the organic functional groups of silicon Compound A capable of undergoing a crosslinking reaction upon exposure to UV radiation". The remaining changes to Claim 36

proposed by the Examiner involve minor changes in wording. The remaining claims have been amended to depend on new Claim 36, where appropriate, and in the case of Claim 4 the phrase "at least one of the at least two" has been added before the term "organofunctional" and the term "group" has been amended to "groups". Claim 5 has been amended in the same manner as Claim 4 and the phrase "or combinations thereof" has been deleted and the phrase "at least one" has been added before the phrase "free radical". Claims 6 and 22 have been amended to correct a typographical error in the formula for hydrochloric acid. Claims 13 and 29 have been amended to insert the phrase "at least one" before "linear, branched or cyclic alkyl group" and the term "alkylene" has been deleted and replaced by the phrase "alkyl or alkenyl". Basis for the change may be found on page 5, lines 5-16 of the specification. Claims 15 and 31 have been amended to delete the term "composition" and replace it with the term "fiber". Basis for this change may be found on page 7, lines 27 and 28 of the specification. No new matter has been added into the amended claims or the new claim.

The rejection of Claims 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by, or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Yoneda et al. or Ikenaga et al. and the rejection of Claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Ikenaga et al. is traversed.

With the cancellation of Claims 33-35 this rejection is now moot.

The objection to Claims 15 and 31 has been obviated by the deletion of the term "composition" and the substitution of the term "fiber" therefor.

The rejection of Claims 1 and 4-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is traversed.

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to comply with the requirements of the Examiner by incorporating much of the Examiner's proposed language into new Claim 36. It


U.S. Application No.: 10/035,168
Reply to Office Action of January 7, 2004

is clear that compounds A and B are not limited to monomers or oligomers, as proposed by the Examiner, and this language has not been included in the claim. Claims 4 and 5 have been amended to distinguish between the different organofunctional groups set forth in new Claim 36. Claim 13 has not been amended in this manner, since page 3, lines 23-26 gives examples of functional groups which may be crosslinked by UV radiation and Claim 13 includes examples of such groups in the Markush recitation and, since the claim refers back to new Claim 36, the differentiation between the different organofunctional groups in silicon Compound A is clear. The claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

In view of the fact that all issues in the case have now been resolved, it is submitted that Claims 4-32 and 36 are allowable and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Norman F. Oblon
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 24,618

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)

Roland E. Martin
Registration No. 48,082